

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/035,423	RIBAK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kelvin Lin	2142	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Kelvin Lin. (3) Sanford Colb (Reg. No. 26856).
 (2) Andrew Caldwell (SPE). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 16 October 2006.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Moody (PGPUB 20030167310).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



ANDREW CALDWELL
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

(P) In the interview, Moody was discussed, particularly Figure 7 and the supporting portions of the publication. The Examiner suggested that the claim in the proposed amendment does not distinguish between a chart where the node represents a single person and one where the node represents a plurality of persons. It was agreed that if the applicants would (1) amend their claims to include this limitation "single person" and (2) argue this point with respect to Moody, whose nodes shown in Figure 7 represent documents involving multiple people, then the claims would be in condition for allowance assuming no new art was discovered in a subsequent search.